

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/694,090	Applicant(s) GUYOT-SIONNEST ET AL.
	Examiner Nikolas J. Uhlir	Art Unit 1773

All Participants:

(1) Nikolas J. Uhlir.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Jonathan Taylor.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 October 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic

Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

all pending

Prior art documents discussed:

"Electron and Hole Injection in PBSE Quantum Dot Films," Wehrenberg and Guyot-Sionnest, Journal of the American Chemical Society, vol 125, 2003, p. 7806-7807

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed the applicants representative that the above noted article (which was co-authored by one of the instant inventors two and half years after the filing of the instant application) contains a statements that "To date, we know of no studies that have achieved hole injection into quantum confined states and recorded the corresponding spectroscopic changes needed to conform to this fact." The examiner informed the applicants representative that this statement appeared to be an express admission by one of the inventors of the instant application that the invention as claimed (which includes nanocrystals doped with electrons or holes) was not enabled with respect to the hole doping as of the date of filing.